REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on June 27, 2003. Claims 1-31 were pending in the application. With this amendment, claims 1-5, 10, 12-14, 17, 20-21, 24-26 and 29-31 are amended, claims 18 and 19 are canceled, claims 32 and 33 are added and the remaining claims are unchanged in the application.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Loatman et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,914,590 (Loatman et al.). On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 17-31 under 35 U.S.C.§103(a) as being obvious in view of Loatman et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections.

As acknowledged by the Examiner on page 6 of the Office Action, Loatman et al. does not appear to teach or suggest that either rules which were unsuccessfully applied to the input text, or rules which were not applied at all to the input text in obtaining the displayed parse, are displayed to the user. As described in the background portion of the present application, this requires the user, when debugging the system, to remember all rules which could apply to the input text, and to choose one of those rules, from the user's memory, to correct an incorrect parse. This does not appear to be addressed anywhere by Loatman et al.

Instead, the passages of Loatman et al. cited by the Examiner appear to show nothing more than displaying the rules which were actually and successfully applied to the input text to obtain the displayed parse. If the user is not satisfied with the parse, or if the parse is actually incorrect, the user is still faced with the same problem discussed with respect to prior art systems - that is, the user must rely on his or her memory to recall the rules which could be applied in a given situation, and to modify the parse by entering one of those alternate rules.

By contrast, independent claim 1 of the present application specifically states that a first plurality of display items are displayed, "the display items include alternate rules, other than the rules used in generating a constituent at the selected connecting point." Similarly, claim 10 states that "the menu items including an alternate grammar rules display item which, when activated, displays alternate grammar rules comprising rules not successfully applied in generating the parse tree." Thus, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 10 are allowable over Loatman et al.

Similarly, it does not appear that Loatman et al. accommodates for a natural language processing system which may parse an input text in more than one allowable way. In other words, a given input text may be able to be correctly parsed in a number of different ways. It is then up to the user to select which of the proper parses correspond to the desired meaning of the input text. The portions of Loatman et al. cited by the Examiner appear to teach nothing more than the natural language processing system generating a single parse and displaying that single parse to the user. If the user wishes to change the parse, the user has no choice but to rewrite different portions of the parse to obtain a desired parse, which is different from that originally displayed by the system.

By contrast, independent claim 24 of the present application specifically states "generating a plurality of different parse trees for a textual input; displaying one of the plurality of parse trees… receiving control input selecting a new parse… and… displaying another of the plurality of parse trees." The system thus allows the user to select, for display, different ones of the parses by simply providing a control input (such as clicking on a button on a displayed user interface). It does not appear that Loatman et al. addresses this in anyway. Therefore,

Applicant submits that independent claim 24 is allowable over Loatman et al.

Finally, it does not appear that Loatman et al. provides any user interface control for allowing a user to rapidly switch among the various parses for the various training sentences in a training corpus. By contrast, independent claim 29 states "receiving user control input selecting a new textual input to be parsed… and displaying said new parse of said new textual input as a new parse tree." Since Loatman et al. does not teach or suggest this, Applicant submits that independent claim 29 is allowable.

In sum, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 10, 24 and 29 are allowable over Loatman et al. Applicant further submits that dependent claims 2-9, 11-17 and 20-33, which depend from the independent claims, are allowable as well. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-17 and 20-33 are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: _____
Joseph R. Kelly, Reg. No. 34,847
Suite 1600 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

JRK:slg